

6-1-1969

Eastern Washington Review, Summer 1969

Eastern Washington State College

Follow this and additional works at: https://dc.ewu.edu/alumni_pubs

Recommended Citation

Eastern Washington State College, "Eastern Washington Review, Summer 1969" (1969). *Alumni Publications*. 29.
https://dc.ewu.edu/alumni_pubs/29

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Eastern Washington University Digital History Collections at EWU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Alumni Publications by an authorized administrator of EWU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact jotto@ewu.edu.

Alumni

Eastern Washington State College

Review

SPECIAL EDITION
SPRING, 1969



Who's in Charge?

*Trustees . . . presidents . . . faculty . . . students, past and present:
who governs this society that we call 'the academic community'?*

THE CRY has been heard on many a campus this year. It came from the campus neighborhood, from state legislatures, from corporations trying to recruit students as employees, from the armed services, from the donors of funds, from congressional committees, from church groups, from the press, and even from the police:

"Who's in charge there?"

Surprisingly, the cry also came from "inside" the colleges and universities—from students and alumni, from faculty members and administrators, and even from presidents and trustees:

"Who's in charge here?"

And there was, on occasion, this variation: "Who should be in charge here?"

STRANGE QUESTIONS to ask about these highly organized institutions of our highly organized society. A sign, as some have said, that our colleges and universities are hopelessly chaotic, that they need more "direction," that they have lagged behind other institutions of our society in organizing themselves into smooth-running, efficient mechanisms?

Or do such explanations miss the point? Do they overlook much of the complexity and subtlety (and perhaps some of the genius) of America's higher educational enterprise?

It is important to try to know.

Here is one reason:

► Nearly 7-million students are now enrolled in the nation's colleges and universities. Eight years hence, the total will have rocketed past 13-million. The conclusion is inescapable: what affects our colleges and universities will affect unprecedented numbers of our people—and, in unprecedented ways, the American character.

Here is another:

► "The campus reverberates today perhaps in part because so many have come to regard it as the most promising of all institutions for developing cures for society's ills." [Lloyd H. Eliott, president of George Washington University]

Here is another:

► "Men must be discriminating appraisers of their society, knowing coolly and precisely what it is about society that thwarts or limits them and therefore needs modification.

"And so they must be discriminating protectors of their institutions, preserving those features that nourish and strengthen them and make them more free." [John W. Gardner, at Cornell University]

But *who* appraises our colleges and universities? *Who* decides whether (and how) they need modifying? *Who* determines what features to preserve; which features "nourish and strengthen them and make them more free?" In short:

Who's in charge there?

THE MARGIN OF EXCELLENCE DRIVE
NEEDS YOUR SUPPORT

SEND YOUR CONTRIBUTION TODAY!



This Special Report prepared by the Editorial Projects for Education organization affiliated with the American Alumni Council asks, expands and attempts to answer one of the simplest, yet most complex questions facing the academic community today: "Who's in Charge?"

The concluding line is "The trustees are. The faculty is. The students are. The president is. YOU are."

But to arrive at that conclusion the report covers the pros and cons of many problem areas which lurk beneath the simple question which is the title to the report.

As the conclusion approaches, the report quotes the question posed by Chancellor Gould of the State University of New York: "Do we believe deeply enough in the principle of an intellectually free and self-regulating university that we are willing to exercise the necessary caution which will permit the institution — with its faults — to survive and even flourish?"

The report challenges alumni everywhere as it continues:

"In answering that question, the alumni and alumnae have a crucial part to play. As former students they know the importance of the higher educational process as few others do. They understand why it is, and must be, controversial; why it does, and must, generate frictions; why it is, and must be, free. And as members of the public, they can be higher education's most informed and persuasive spokesmen."

This question "Who's in Charge?" is especially timely because of the frequency with which it was heard during Eastern's all-campus convocation of May 21. After months of preparation by faculty, students and administration, the College spent a day in discussing a study in depth of EWSC's role in the future. Position papers prepared at the request of the special Task Force headed by Dr. Stanley Robinson were discussed during the afternoon after an all-campus gathering in the morning to hear a student panel present views of the problems. The study is expected to continue for a year, or more.

Eastern Alumni have been invited to prepare and submit position papers as outlined in the regular Spring Edition of Alumni Review.

"Possibly the timeliness of this report will inspire many Eastern Alumni to respond to Dr. Robinson's invitation and prepare papers based on their experience at Eastern and since graduating that will add to the store of ideas being sought during this year to come," said Graham Johnson, Alumni Association executive secretary. "I hope so."

THE EASTERN WASHINGTON REVIEW

Eastern Washington State College
Cheney, Washington

Editor _____ Brent Stark
Business Manager _____ Graham Johnson

SPECIAL EDITION

Published quarterly by Eastern Washington State College. The Review is designed to furnish news of the college and alumni. Entered as second class matter at Cheney, Washington 99004.

VOL. 19, NO. 2 JUNE, 1969

EWSC ALUMNI OFFICERS

President
Bill Hinchliffe _____ Richland
President-Elect
Robert Lincoln _____ Kirkland
Vice-President
Roland Jantz _____ Richland
Recording Secretary
Gerri Cobb _____ Spokane
Executive Secretary
Graham Johnson _____ Cheney

DISTRICT DIRECTORS

Jack Hall _____ N. E. Washington Area
(Colville Public Schools)
Wayne Goodson _____ North Idaho Area
(Pinehurst Elementary School)
Orland Favaro _____ Ritzville-Othello Area
(Othello Public Schools)
Vernon Risley _____ Wenatchee-
Okanogan Area
(Lake Chelan Public Schools)
Bob Atkinson _____ Moses Lake-
Ellensburg Area
(Ephrata Public Schools)
Dick Campanelli _____ Walla Walla Area
(Walla Walla Public Schools)
Robert Wilson _____ Tri-City Area
(Richland Public Schools)
Bruce Penny _____ Puget Sound Area
(Seattle Post Intelligencer)
George Sanders _____ Portland-S.W.
Washington Area
(Camas Public Schools)
Bob Kuehl _____ N.W. Spokane County
(Spokane Public Schools)
Merton Grey _____ N.E. Spokane County
(Spokane Public Schools)
James Van Matre _____ S.W. Spokane
County
(Medical Lake Public Schools)
Walt Schaar _____ S.E. Spokane County
(KSPS Television)
J. Patrick McGee _____ N.W. Wash. Area
(General Telephone Company)
Tom Ennis _____ Lower Puget Sound-
Grays Harbor Area
(Washington Dept. of Public
Assistance)
Michael Murphy _____ ASB President

Cast Your Ballot

The official ballot for the EWSC Alumni Association annual election was printed in the regular spring edition of the Review. All members are urged to return their ballots by the deadline, June 30, and all Grads are urged to become members when they vote.—It's easy.

Who's in Charge?

*Trustees . . . presidents . . . faculty . . . students, past and present:
who governs this society that we call 'the academic community'?*

THE CRY has been heard on many a campus this year. It came from the campus neighborhood, from state legislatures, from corporations trying to recruit students as employees, from the armed services, from the donors of funds, from congressional committees, from church groups, from the press, and even from the police:

"Who's in charge there?"

Surprisingly the cry also came from "inside" the colleges and universities—from students and alumni, from faculty members and administrators, and even from presidents and trustees:

"Who's in charge here?"

And there was, on occasion, this variation: "Who *should* be in charge here?"

STRANGE QUESTIONS to ask about these highly organized institutions of our highly organized society? A sign, as some have said, that our colleges and universities are hopelessly chaotic, that they need more "direction," that they have lagged behind other institutions of our society in organizing themselves into smooth-running, efficient mechanisms?

Or do such explanations miss the point? Do they overlook much of the complexity and subtlety (and perhaps some of the genius) of America's higher educational enterprise?

It is important to try to know.

Here is one reason:

► Nearly 7-million students are now enrolled in the nation's colleges and universities. Eight years hence, the total will have rocketed past 9.3-million. The conclusion is inescapable: what affects our colleges and universities will affect unprecedented numbers of our people—and, in unprecedented ways, the American character.

Here is another:

► "The campus reverberates today perhaps in part because so many have come to regard [it] as the most promising of all institutions for developing cures for society's ills." [Lloyd H. Elliott, president of George Washington University]

Here is another:

► "Men must be discriminating appraisers of their society, knowing coolly and precisely what it is about society that thwarts or limits them and therefore needs modification.

"And so they must be discriminating protectors of their institutions, preserving those features that nourish and strengthen them and make them more free." [John W. Gardner, at Cornell University]


But *who* appraises our colleges and universities? *Who* decides whether (and how) they need modifying? *Who* determines what features to preserve; which features "nourish and strengthen them and make them more free?" In short:

Who's in charge there?

Who's in Charge—I The Trustees

BY THE LETTER of the law, the people in charge of our colleges and universities are the trustees or regents—25,000 of them, according to the educated guess of their principal national organization, the Association of Governing Boards.

"In the long history of higher education in America," said one astute observer recently,



“trustees have seldom been cast in a heroic role.” For decades they have been blamed for whatever faults people have found with the nation’s colleges and universities.

Trustees have been charged, variously, with representing the older generation, the white race, religious orthodoxy, political powerholders, business and economic conservatism—in short, The Establishment. Other critics—among them orthodox theologians, political powerholders, business and economic conservatives—have accused trustees of not being Establishment *enough*.

On occasion they have earned the criticisms. In the early days of American higher education, when most colleges were associated with churches, the trustees were usually clerics with stern ideas of what should and should not be taught in a church-related institution. They intruded freely in curriculums, courses, and the behavior of students and faculty members.

On many Protestant campuses, around the turn of the century, the clerical influence was lessened and often withdrawn. Clergymen on their boards of trustees were replaced, in many instances, by businessmen, as the colleges and universities sought trustees who could underwrite their solvency. As state systems of higher education were founded, they too were put under the control of lay regents or trustees.

Trustee-faculty conflicts grew. Infringements of academic freedom led to the founding, in 1915, of the American Association of University Professors. Through the association, faculty members developed and gained wide acceptance of strong principles of academic freedom and tenure. The conflicts eased—but even today many faculty members watch their institution’s board of trustees guardedly.

In the past several years, on some campuses, trustees have come under new kinds of attack.

► At one university, students picketed a meeting of the governing board because two of its members, they said, led companies producing weapons used in the war in Vietnam.

► On another campus, students (joined by some faculty members) charged that college funds had been invested in companies operating in racially divided South Africa. The investments, said the students, should be canceled; the board of trustees should be censured.

► At a Catholic institution, two years ago, most students and faculty members went on strike because the trustees (comprising 33 clerics and 11 lay-

men) had dismissed a liberal theologian from the faculty. The board reinstated him, and the strike ended. A year ago the board was reconstituted to consist of 15 clerics and 15 laymen. (A similar shift to laymen on their governing boards is taking place at many Catholic colleges and universities.)

► A state college president, ordered by his trustees to reopen his racially troubled campus, resigned because, he said, he could not “reconcile effectively the conflicts between the trustees” and other groups at his institution.

HOW DO MOST TRUSTEES measure up to their responsibilities? How do they react to the lightning-bolts of criticism that, by their position, they naturally attract? We have talked in recent months with scores of trustees and have collected the written views of many others. Our conclusion: With some notable (and often highly vocal) exceptions, both the breadth and depth of many trustees’ understanding of higher education’s problems, including the touchiness of their own position, are greater than most people suspect.

Many boards of trustees, we found, are showing deep concern for the views of students and are going to extraordinary lengths to know them better. Increasing numbers of boards are rewriting their by-laws to include students (as well as faculty members) in their membership.

William S. Paley, chairman of CBS and a trustee of Columbia University, said after the student outbreaks on that troubled campus:

“The university may seem [to students] like just one more example of the establishment’s trying to run their lives without consulting them. . . . It is essential that we make it possible for students to work for the correction of such conditions legitimately and effectively rather than compulsively and violently. . . .

“Legally the university is the board of trustees, but actually it is very largely the community of teachers and students. That a board of trustees should commit a university community to policies and actions without the components of that community participating in discussions leading to such commitments has become obsolete and unworkable.”

Less often than one might expect, considering some of the provocations, did we find boards of trustees giving “knee-jerk” reactions even to the most extreme demands presented to them. Not very long ago, most boards might have rejected such

The role of higher education’s trustees often is misinterpreted and misunderstood

As others seek a greater voice, presidents are natural targets for their attack

demands out of hand; no longer. James M. Hester, the president of New York University, described the change:

"To the activist mind, the fact that our board of trustees is legally entrusted with the property and privileges of operating an educational institution is more an affront than an acceptable fact. What is considered relevant is what is called the social reality, not the legal authority.

"A decade ago the reaction of most trustees and presidents to assertions of this kind was a forceful statement of the rights and responsibilities of a private institution to do as it sees fit. While faculty control over the curriculum and, in many cases, student discipline was delegated by most boards long before, the power of the trustees to set university policy in other areas and to control the institution financially was unquestioned.

"Ten years ago authoritarian answers to radical questions were frequently given with confidence. Now, however, authoritarian answers, which often provide emotional release when contemplated, somehow seem inappropriate when delivered."

AS A RESULT, trustees everywhere are re-examining their role in the governance of colleges and universities, and changes seem certain. Often the changes will be subtle, perhaps consisting of a shift in attitude, as President Hester suggested. But they will be none the less profound.

In the process it seems likely that trustees, as Vice-Chancellor Ernest L. Boyer of the State University of New York put it, will "recognize that the college is not only a place where past achievements are preserved and transmitted, but also a place where the conventional wisdom is constantly subjected to merciless scrutiny."

Mr. Boyer continued:

"A board member who accepts this fact will remain poised when surrounded by cross-currents of controversy. . . . He will come to view friction as an essential ingredient in the life of a university, and vigorous debate not as a sign of decadence, but of robust health.

"And, in recognizing these facts for himself, the trustee will be equipped to do battle when the college—and implicitly the whole enterprise of higher education—is threatened by earnest primitives, single-minded fanatics, or calculating demagogues."

WHO'S IN CHARGE? Every eight years, on the average, the members of a college or university board must provide a large part of the answer by reaching, in Vice-Chancellor Boyer's words, "the most crucial decision a trustee will ever be called upon to make."

They must choose a new president for the place and, as they have done with his predecessors, delegate much of their authority to him.

The task is not easy. At any given moment, it has been estimated, some 300 colleges and universities in the United States are looking for presidents. The qualifications are high, and the requirements are so exacting that many top-flight persons to whom a presidency is offered turn down the job.

As the noise and violence level of campus protests has risen in recent years, the search for presidents has grown more difficult—and the turndowns more frequent.


"Fellow targets," a speaker at a meeting of college presidents and other administrators called his audience last fall. The audience laughed nervously. The description, they knew, was all too accurate.

"Even in the absence of strife and disorder, academic administrators are the men caught in the middle as the defenders—and, altogether too often these days, the beleaguered defenders—of institutional integrity," Logan Wilson, president of the American Council on Education, has said. "Although college or university presidencies are still highly respected positions in our society, growing numbers of campus malcontents seem bent on doing everything they can to harass and discredit the performers of these key roles."

This is unfortunate—the more so because the harassment frequently stems from a deep misunderstanding of the college administrator's function.

The most successful administrators cast themselves in a "staff" or "service" role, with the well-being of the faculty and students their central concern. Assuming such a role often takes a large measure of stamina and goodwill. At many institutions, both faculty members and students habitually blame administrators for whatever ails them—and it is hard for even the most dedicated of administrators to remember that they and the faculty-student critics are on the same side.

"Without administrative leadership," philosopher Sidney Hook has observed, "every institution . . . runs down hill. The greatness of a university consists



Who's in Charge – II
The President

A college's heart is its faculty. What part should it have in running the place?

predominantly in the greatness of its faculty. But faculties . . . do not themselves build great faculties. To build great faculties, administrative leadership is essential."

Shortly after the start of this academic year, however, the American Council on Education released the results of a survey of what 2,040 administrators, trustees, faculty members, and students foresaw for higher education in the 1970's. Most thought "the authority of top administrators in making broad policy decisions will be significantly eroded or diffused." And three out of four faculty members said they found the prospect "desirable."

Who's in charge? Clearly the answer to that question changes with every passing day.

WITH IT ALL, the job of the president has grown to unprecedented proportions. The old responsibilities of leading the faculty and students have proliferated. The new responsibilities of money-raising and business management have been heaped on top of them. The brief span of the typical presidency—about eight years—testifies to the roughness of the task.

Yet a president and his administration very often exert a decisive influence in governing a college or university. One president can set a pace and tone that invigorate an entire institution. Another president can enervate it.

At Columbia University, for instance, following last year's disturbances there, an impartial fact-finding commission headed by Archibald Cox traced much of the unrest among students and faculty members to "Columbia's organization and style of administration":

"The administration of Columbia's affairs too often conveyed an attitude of authoritarianism and invited distrust. In part, the appearance resulted from style; for example, it gave affront to read that an influential university official was no more interested in student opinion on matters of intense concern to students than he was in their taste for strawberries.

"In part, the appearance reflected the true state of affairs. . . . The president was unwilling to surrender absolute disciplinary powers. In addition, government by improvisation seems to have been not an exception, but the rule."

At San Francisco State College, last December, the leadership of Acting President S. I. Hayakawa,

whether one approved it or not, was similarly decisive. He confronted student demonstrators, promised to suspend any faculty members or students who disrupted the campus, reopened the institution under police protection, and then considered the dissidents' demands.

But looking ahead, he said, "We must eventually put campus discipline in the hands of responsible faculty and student groups who will work cooperatively with administrations"

WHO'S IN CHARGE? "However the power mixture may be stirred," says Dean W. Donald Bowles of American University, "in an institution aspiring to quality, the role of the faculty remains central. No president can prevail indefinitely without at least the tacit support of the faculty. Few deans will last more than a year or two if the faculty does not approve their policies."

The power of the faculty in the academic activities of a college or university has long been recognized. Few boards of trustees would seriously consider infringing on the faculty's authority over what goes on in the classroom. As for the college or university president, he almost always would agree with McGeorge Bundy, president of the Ford Foundation, that he is, "on academic matters, the agent and not the master of the faculty."

A joint statement by three major organizations representing trustees, presidents, and professors has spelled out the faculty's role in governing a college or university. It says, in part:

"The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process.

"On these matters, the power of review or final decision lodged in the governing board or delegated by it to the president should be exercised adversely only in exceptional circumstances. . . .

"The faculty sets the requirements for the degrees offered in course, determines when the requirements have been met, and authorizes the president and board to grant the degrees thus achieved.

"Faculty status and related matters are primarily a faculty responsibility. This area includes appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of tenure, and dismissal. . . . The governing board and president should, on

questions of faculty status, as in other matters where the faculty has primary responsibility, concur with the faculty judgment except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be stated in detail.

"The faculty should actively participate in the determination of policies and procedures governing salary increases. . . .

"Agencies for faculty participation in the government of the college or university should be established at each level where faculty responsibility is present. . . ."

Few have quarreled with the underlying reason for such faculty autonomy: the protection of academic freedom. But some thoughtful observers of the college and university scene think some way must be found to prevent an undesirable side effect: the perpetuation of comfortable ruts, in which individual faculty members might prefer to preserve the status quo rather than approve changes that the welfare of their students, their institutions, and society might demand.


The president of George Washington University, Lloyd H. Elliott, put it this way last fall:

"Under the banner of academic freedom, [the individual professor's] authority for his own course has become an almost unchallenged right. He has been not only free to ignore suggestions for change, but licensed, it is assumed, to prevent any change he himself does not choose.

"Even in departments where courses are sequential, the individual professor chooses the degree to

Who's in Charge—III

The Faculty



Who's in Charge—IV

The Students



which he will accommodate his course to others in the sequence. The question then becomes: What restructuring is possible or desirable within the context of the professor's academic freedom?"

ANOTHER PHENOMENON has affected the faculty's role in governing the colleges and universities in recent years. Louis T. Benezet, president of the Claremont Graduate School and University Center, describes it thus:

"Socially, the greatest change that has taken place on the American campus is the professionalization of the faculty. . . . The pattern of faculty activity both inside and outside the institution has changed accordingly.

"The original faculty corporation *was* the university. It is now quite unstable, composed of mobile professors whose employment depends on regional or national conditions in their field, rather than on an organic relationship to their institution and even

less on the relationship to their administrative heads. . . .

"With such powerful changes at work strengthening the professor as a specialist, it has become more difficult to promote faculty responsibility for educational policy."

Said Columbia trustee William S. Paley: "It has been my own observation that faculties tend to assume the attitude that they are a detached arbitrating force between students on one hand and administrators on the other, with no immediate responsibility for the university as a whole."

YET IN THEORY, at least, faculty members seem to favor the idea of taking a greater part in governing their colleges and universities. In the American Council on Education's survey of predictions for the 1970's, 99 per cent of the faculty members who responded said such participation was "highly desirable" or "essential." Three out of four said it was "almost certain" or "very likely" to develop. (Eight out of ten administrators agreed that greater faculty participation was desirable, although they were considerably less optimistic about its coming about.)

In another survey by the American Council on Education, Archie R. Dykes—now chancellor of the University of Tennessee at Martin—interviewed 106 faculty members at a large midwestern university to get their views on helping to run the institution. He found "a pervasive ambivalence in faculty attitudes toward participation in decision-making."

Faculty members "indicated the faculty should have a strong, active, and influential role in decisions," but "revealed a strong reticence to give the time such a role would require," Mr. Dykes reported. "Asserting that faculty participation is essential, they placed participation at the bottom of the professional priority list and deprecated their colleagues who do participate."

Kramer Rohlfleisch, a history professor at San Diego State College, put it this way at a meeting of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities: "If we do shoulder this burden [of academic governance] to excess, just who will tend the academic store, do the teaching, and extend the range of human knowledge?"

The report of a colloquium at Teachers College, New York, took a different view: "Future encounters [on the campuses] may be even less likely of

resolution than the present difficulties unless both faculty members and students soon gain widened perspectives on issues of university governance."

WHO'S IN CHARGE? Today a new group has burst into the picture: the college and university students themselves.

The issues arousing students have been numerous. Last academic year, a nationwide survey by Educational Testing Service found, the Number 1 cause of student unrest was the war in Vietnam; it caused protests at 34 per cent of the 859 four-year colleges and universities studied. The second most frequent cause of unrest was dormitory regulations. This year, many of the most violent campus demonstrations have centered on civil rights.

In many instances the stated issues were the real causes of student protest. In others they provided excuses to radical students whose aims were less the correction of specific ills or the reform of their colleges and universities than the destruction of the political and social system as a whole. It is important to differentiate the two, and a look at the *dramatis personae* can be instructive in doing so.

AT THE LEFT—the "New Left," not to be confused with old-style liberalism—is Students for a Democratic Society, whose leaders often use the issue of university reform to mobilize support from their fellow students and to "radicalize" them. The major concern of SDS is not with the colleges and universities *per se*, but with American society as a whole.

"It is basically impossible to have an honest university in a dishonest society," said the chairman of SDS at Columbia, Mark Rudd, in what was a fairly representative statement of the SDS attitude. Last year's turmoil at Columbia, in his view, was immensely valuable as a way of educating students and the public to the "corrupt and exploitative" nature of U.S. society.

"It's as if you had reformed Heidelberg in 1938," an SDS member is likely to say, in explanation of his philosophy. "You would still have had Hitler's Germany outside the university walls."

The SDS was founded in 1962. Today it is a loosely organized group with some 35,000 members, on about 350 campuses. Nearly everyone who has studied the SDS phenomenon agrees its members are highly idealistic and very bright. Their idealism has

'Student power' has many meanings, as the young seek a role in college governance



Attached to a college (intellectually,

led them to a disappointment with the society around them, and they have concluded it is corrupt.

Most sds members disapprove of the Russian experience with socialism, but they seem to admire the Cuban brand. Recently, however, members returning from visits to Cuba have appeared disillusioned by repressive measures they have seen the government applying there.

The meetings of sds—and, to a large extent, the activities of the national organization, generally—have an improvisational quality about them. This often carries over into the sds view of the future. “We can’t explain what form the society will take after the revolution,” a member will say. “We’ll just have to wait and see how it develops.”

In recent months the sds outlook has become increasingly bitter. Some observers, noting the escalation in militant rhetoric coming from sds headquarters in Chicago, fear the radical movement soon may adopt a more openly aggressive strategy.

Still, it is doubtful that sds, in its present state of organization, would be capable of any sustained, concerted assault on the institutions of society. The organization is diffuse, and its members have a strong antipathy toward authority. They dislike carrying out orders, whatever the source.

FAR MORE INFLUENTIAL in the long run, most observers believe, will be the U.S. National Student Association. In the current spectrum of student activism on the campuses, leaders of the NSA consider their members “moderates,” not radicals. A former NSA president, Edward A. Schwartz, explains the difference:

“The moderate student says, ‘We’ll go on strike, rather than burn the buildings down.’ ”

The NSA is the national organization of elected student governments on nearly 400 campuses. Its Washington office shows an increasing efficiency and militancy—a reflection, perhaps, of the fact that many college students take student government much more seriously, today, than in the past.

The NSA talks of “student power” and works at it: more student participation in the decision-making at the country’s colleges and universities. And it wants changes in the teaching process and the traditional curriculum.

In pursuit of these goals, the NSA sends advisers around the country to help student governments with their battles. The advisers often urge the students to take their challenges to authority to the

emotionally) and detached (physically), alumni can be a great and healthy force

courts, and the NSA's central office maintains an up-to-date file of precedent cases and judicial decisions.

A major aim of NSA this year is reform of the academic process. With a \$315,000 grant from the Ford Foundation, the association has established a center for educational reform, which encourages students to set up their own classes as alternative models, demonstrating to the colleges and universities the kinds of learning that students consider worthwhile.

The Ford grant, say NSA officials, will be used to "generate quiet revolutions instead of ugly ones" on college campuses. The NSA today is an organization that wants to reform society from within, rather than destroy it and then try to rebuild.

Also in the picture are organizations of militant Negro students, such as the Congress for the Unity of Black Students, whose founding sessions at Shaw University last spring drew 78 delegates from 37 colleges and universities. The congress is intended as a campus successor to the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. It will push for courses on the history, culture, art, literature, and music of Negroes. Its founders urged students to pursue their goals without interfering with the orderly operation of their colleges or jeopardizing their own academic activities. (Some other organizations of black students are considerably more militant.)

And, as a "constructive alternative to the disruptive approach," an organization called Associated Student Governments of the U.S.A. claims a membership of 150 student governments and proclaims that it has "no political intent or purpose," only "the sharing of ideas about student government."

These are some of the principal national groups. In addition, many others exist as purely local organizations, concerned with only one campus or specific issues.

EXCEPT FOR THOSE whose aim is outright disruption for disruption's sake, many such student reformers are gaining a respectful hearing from college and university administrators, faculty members, and trustees—even as the more radical militants are meeting greater resistance. And increasing numbers of institutions have devised, or are seeking, ways of making the students a part of the campus decision-making process.

It isn't easy. "The problem of constructive student

participation—participation that gets down to the 'nitty-gritty'—is of course difficult," Dean C. Peter Magrath of the University of Nebraska's College of Arts and Sciences has written. "Students are birds of passage who usually lack the expertise and sophistication to function effectively on complex university affairs until their junior and senior years. Within a year or two they graduate, but the administration and faculty are left with the policies they helped devise. A student generation lasts for four years; colleges and universities are more permanent."

Yale University's President Kingman Brewster, testifying before the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, gave these four "prescriptions" for peaceful student involvement:

- ▶ Free expression must be "absolutely guaranteed, no matter how critical or demonstrative it may be."

- ▶ Students must have an opportunity to take part in "the shaping and direction of the programs, activities, and regulations which affect them."


- ▶ Channels of communication must be kept open. "The freedom of student expression must be matched by a willingness to listen seriously."


- ▶ The student must be treated as an individual, with "considerable latitude to design his own program and way of life."

With such guidelines, accompanied by positive action to give students a voice in the college and university affairs that concern them, many observers think a genuine solution to student unrest may be attainable. And many think the students' contribution to college and university governance will be substantial, and that the nation's institutions of higher learning will be the better for it.

"Personally," says Otis A. Singletary, vice-chancellor for academic affairs at the University of Texas, "my suspicion is that in university reform, the students are going to make a real impact on the improvement of undergraduate teaching."

Says Morris B. Abram, president of Brandeis University: "Today's students are physically, emotionally, and educationally more mature than my generation at the same age. Moreover, they have become perceptive social critics of society. The reformers among them far outnumber the disrupters. There is little reason to suppose that . . . if given the opportunity, [they] will not infuse good judgment into decisions about the rules governing their lives in this community."





Who's in Charge?

Ideally, a Community

AS FAR as the academic community is concerned, Benjamin Franklin's remark about hanging together or hanging separately has never been more apt. The desire for change is better expressed in common future-making than in disputing who is in and who is out—or how far.

—JOHN CAFFREY, *American Council on Education*

A college or university can be governed well only by a sense of its community

WHO'S IN CHARGE? Trustees and administrators, faculty members and students. Any other answer—any authoritarian answer from one of the groups alone, any call from outside for more centralization of authority to restore “order” to the campuses—misses the point of the academic enterprise as it has developed in the United States.

The concept of that enterprise echoes the European idea of a community of scholars—self-governing, self-determining—teachers and students sharing the goal of pursuing knowledge. But it adds an idea that from the outset was uniquely American: the belief that our colleges and universities must not be self-centered and ingrown, but must serve society.

This idea accounts for putting the ultimate legal authority for our colleges and universities in the hands of the trustees or regents. They represent the view of the larger, outside interest in the institutions: the interest of churches, of governments, of the people. And, as a part of the college or university's government, they represent the institution to the public: defending it against attack, explaining its case to legislatures, corporations, labor unions, church groups, and millions of individual citizens.

Each group in the campus community has its own interests, for which it speaks. Each has its own authority to govern itself, which it exercises. Each has an interest in the institution as a whole, which it expresses. Each, ideally, recognizes the interests of the others, as well as the common cause.

That last, difficult requirement, of course, is where the process encounters the greatest risk of breakdown.

“Almost any proposal for major innovation in the universities today runs head-on into the opposition of powerful vested interests,” John W. Gardner has observed. “And the problem is compounded by the fact that all of us who have grown up in the academic world are skilled in identifying our vested interests with the Good, the True, and the Beautiful, so that any attack on them is, by definition, subversive.”

In times of stress, the risk of a breakdown is especially great. Such times have enveloped us all, in recent years. The breakdowns have occurred, on some campuses—at times spectacularly.

Whenever they happen, cries are heard for abolishing the system. Some demand that campus authority be gathered into the hands of a few, who would then tighten discipline and curb dissent.

Others—at the other end of the spectrum—demand the destruction of the whole enterprise, without proposing any alternatives.

If the colleges and universities survive these demands, it will be because reason again has taken hold. Men and women who would neither destroy the system nor prevent needed reforms in it are hard at work on nearly every campus in America, seeking ways to keep the concept of the academic community strong, innovative, and workable.

The task is tough, demanding, and likely to continue for years to come. “For many professors,” said the president of Cornell University, James A. Perkins, at a convocation of alumni, “the time required to regain a sense of campus community . . . demands painful choices.” But wherever that sense has been lost or broken down, regaining it is essential.

The alternatives are unacceptable. “If this community forgets itself and its common stake and destiny,” John Caffrey has written, “there are powers outside that community who will be only too glad to step in and manage for us.” Chancellor Samuel B. Gould, of the State University of New York, put it in these words to a committee of the state legislature:

“This tradition of internal governance . . . must—at all cost—be preserved. Any attempt, however well-intentioned, to ignore trustee authority or to undermine the university's own patterns of operation, will vitiate the spirit of the institution and, in time, kill the very thing it seeks to preserve.”

WHO'S IN CHARGE THERE? The jigsaw puzzle, put together on the preceding page, shows the participants: trustees, administrators, professors, students, ex-students. But a piece is missing. It must be supplied, if the answer to our question is to be accurate and complete.

It is the American people themselves. By direct and indirect means, on both public and private colleges and universities, they exert an influence that few of them suspect.

The people wield their greatest power through governments. For the present year, through the 50 states, they have appropriated more than \$5-billion in tax funds for college and university operating expenses alone. This is more than three times the \$1.5-billion of only eight years ago. As an expression of the people's decision-making power in higher

Simultaneously, much power is held by 'outsiders' usually unaware of their role

education, nothing could be more eloquent.

Through the federal government, the public's power to chart the course of our colleges and universities has been demonstrated even more dramatically. How the federal government has spent money throughout U.S. higher education has changed the colleges and universities in a way that few could have visualized a quarter-century ago.

Here is a hard look at what this influence has meant. It was written by Clark Kerr for the Brookings Institution's "Agenda for the Nation," presented to the Nixon administration:

"Power is allocated with money," he wrote.

"The day is largely past of the supremacy of the autocratic president, the all-powerful chairman of the board, the feared chairman of the state appropriations committee, the financial patron saint, the all-wise foundation executive guiding higher education into new directions, the wealthy alumnus with his pet projects, the quiet but effective representatives of the special interests. This shift of power can be seen and felt on almost every campus. Twenty years of federal impact has been the decisive influence in bringing it about.

"Decisions are being made in more places, and

more of these places are external to the campus."

The process began with the land-grant movement of the nineteenth century, which enlisted higher education's resources in the industrial and agricultural growth of the nation. It reached explosive proportions in World War II, when the government went to the colleges and universities for desperately needed technology and research. After the war, spurred by the launching of Russia's Sputnik, federal support of activities on the campuses grew rapidly.

MILLIONS OF DOLLARS every year went to the campuses for research. Most of it was allocated to individual faculty members, and their power grew proportionately. So did their independence from the college or university that employed them. So did the importance of research in their lives. Clearly that was where the money and prestige lay; at

Who's in Charge—V

The Public

Illustrated by Jerry Dadds





Drive Needs YOU

Please note change of address here, tear out and mail to Alumni office

The major thrust of the 1969 EWSC Alumni Fund drive has attracted gifts from a scant 244 persons — an unbelievably low 2½% of the alumni contacted. Gifts total \$2514.50, which is well below the 1968 final tally of \$4424.50 and embarrassingly short of what should reasonably be expected from 9111 alumni now on the rolls.

A person's participation has always been considered more important than the amount he gives. Modest gifts from many will add up rapidly to build the needed financial resource. Across the nation 15% of the public higher education alumni contribute financially to their college. Eastern alumni can surely equal or better that figure.

The concept of the "Margin of Excellence" program is simply this: Tax monies provided to EWSC by the legislature are adequate enough to carry out the instructional responsibilities only. Other ex-

pected roles must be funded through the "investment" of persons interested in seeing the college make a greater contribution to the region it serves. Projects of community service and research activity of an extent and nature as to compliment and support classroom instruction would satisfy the additional roles and would help Eastern increase its Margin of Excellence. The College must first turn to its graduates and former students for the added support and encouragement.

Somehow, Eastern alumni must recognize that recent letters requesting support are not just "asking for money," but are inviting every alumnus to become involved in making something good, necessary and important happen at EWSC! Act now. Send your gift to the EWSC Alumni Office.

The 1969

EWSC
Alumni Fund

*BUILDING THE
MARGIN OF
EXCELLENCE*



Support Your Margin of Excellence Drive